



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/687,483	10/13/2000	Andreas Braun	24736-2033	7859
20985	7590 11/04/2004		EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, PC			CLOW, LORI A	
12390 EL CAMINO REAL SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2081			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1631	
		DATE MAILED: 11/04/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/687,483	KOSTER ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Lori A. Clow, Ph.D.	1631			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. msions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timed within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 Ju	<u>ıly 2004</u> .				
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) This	action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>4,5,9-15,31-34,43,44,47-50,54 and 98</u> 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>4,5,9-15,31-34,43,44,47-50,54 and 98</u> Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration. 8-125 is/are rejected.	ation.			
Applicat	ion Papers					
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)l	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
2) Notic	te of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ite			
3) 🛛 Infori	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date 2/6/04;4/20/04.	5)	atent Application (PTO-152)			

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' response, filed 29 August 2004 has been fully considered. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Claims 4, 5, 9-15, 31-34, 43, 44, 47-50, 54, and 98-125 are currently pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Information Disclosure Statements filed 6 February 2004 and 20 April 2004 have been considered. Signed copies of PTO Forms 1449 are included with this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 4, 5, 9-15, 31, 43, 44, 47-50, 109-125 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Campbell et al. (WO 98/35609) for the reasons set forth in the previous Office Action.

Applicant argues that "the specification discloses a strategy to identify polymorphisms using the healthy subject database that does not require comparison to a diseased population. As discussed above, the instant application provides methods to identify polymorphisms and other

Art Unit: 1631

markers that may be related to a pre-determined parameter, such as age, sex, or ethnicity, without prior knowledge of their existence, by stratifying information in healthy subject databases (information from individuals selected only on the basis of being healthy) according to predetermined parameters. Any marker that exhibits a statistically significant frequency change as a function of the parameter is a candidate for further investigation".

This argument is not persuasive because, while it may be true that the specification discloses a strategy to identify polymorphisms using the healthy subject database that does not require comparison to a diseased population, the claims do not read as such. The claims recite, "a method of producing a database comprising: selecting only healthy members of a population of organisms not manifesting any disease state". The claims do not exclude the fact that a database could contain both healthy population data, as well as disease population data in subsets, as is disclosed in Campbell et al. Campbell et al. disclose, as was previously stated, a computer-based system for predicting the future health of individuals comprising biomarker values from individual members of a test population. The population consists of two subpopulations, those having acquired a specified biological condition and those not having acquired the specified biological condition (abstract).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 09/687,483

Art Unit: 1631

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 32-34, 99, 100, and 102 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0596205 A2 (Bullaughey et al.), in view of Campbell (WO 98/35609), in further view of US 5,498,545 (Vestal), for the reasons set forth in the previous Office Action.

Applicant argues that neither Bullaughey et al. nor Vestal teach or suggest a healthy subject database. However, Campbell et al. is relied upon to teach this limitation. No other arguments are presented in reference to Campbell et al.

Claims 54 and 101 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0596205 A2 (Bullaughey et al.), in view of Campbell (WO 98/35609).

Applicant argues that Bullaughey et al. do not teach or suggest a healthy subject database. However, Campbell et al. is relied upon to teach this limitation. No other arguments are presented in reference to Campbell et al.

Claim 98 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell (WO 98/35609), in view of US 5,498,545 (Vestal), for the reasons set forth in the previous Office Action.

Applicant argues that Vestal does not teach or suggest a healthy subject database. However, Campbell et al. is relied upon to teach this limitation. No other arguments are presented in reference to Campbell et al.

Claims 103-108 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0596205 A2 (Bullaughey et al.), in view of Campbell (WO 98/35609), in view of US 5,498,545

Art Unit: 1631

(Vestal), in further view of US 6,602,662 (Koster et al.), for the reasons set forth in the previous Office Action.

Applicant presents the same argument as above in reference to Koster et al. Again, Campbell et al. is relied upon to teach this limitation. No other arguments are presented in reference to Campbell et al.

Conclusion

Rejections under 35 USC 101 have been withdrawn in view of Applicant's response.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquiries

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located

Art Unit: 1631

in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (See 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The CM1 Fax Center Number is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lori A. Clow, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0715. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 10 am to 6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael P. Woodward, Ph.D., can be reached on (571) 272-0722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

November 2, 2004 Lori A. Clow, Ph.D.

Art Unit 1631 Lou' L Clow MARJORIEMORAN
PATENTEXABENER

Surjour J. Moron
11/1/04